

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is filed in response to the final Office Action dated February 15, 2011. In the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 7-15, and 18-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,344,796 to Ogilvie et al. (“*Ogilvie*”) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0130065 to Bloom (“*Bloom*”) in further view of U.S. Patent 6,976,090 of Ben-Shaul et al. (“*Ben-Shaul*”). Claims 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ogilvie* in view of *Bloom* and *Ben-Shaul* in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0211834 to Fleckenstein et al. (“*Fleckenstein*”). The listed rejections are addressed below. For the Examiner’s reference, Claims 20-86 were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement, Claims 4-6 were previously canceled, and Claim 1 has been amended in the current response. Claims 1-3 and 7-19 remain currently pending in the application for the Examiner’s consideration.

Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ogilvie* in view of *Bloom* in further view of *Ben-Shaul*. Although Applicants do not agree with the current rejection of Claim 1 based on the cited references, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further distinguish the cited references. For instance, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite providing a customer with a web browser enhancement tool that resides in the customer’s browser and is configured to provide a digital wallet that is configured to allow the customer to purchase credits, the credits being used to pay a fee to the alternate delivery location service provider each time the customer elects to use the ADL as a shipping location. Further, Claim 1 recites providing the ADL to the vendor computer system to use as the shipping location for the product purchased by the customer via the web browser enhancement tool automatically populating form fields of a vendor web page to provide the ADL address for upload to the vendor computer system and deducting the fee from the digital wallet.

Appl. No.: 10/696,180
Amdt. dated May 16, 2011
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2011

Applicants respectfully submit *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, and *Ben-Shaul*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of Claim 1 under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 7-19

Dependent Claims 2-3 and 7-19 have been rejected as unpatentable over various combinations of *Ogilvie*, *Bloom*, *Fleckenstein*, and *Ben-Shaul*. Claims 2-3 and 7-19 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore include all the features of Claim 1 plus additional features that further define the invention over the cited references. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to independent Claim 1 and the additional features that further define the invention over the cited references, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of these claims under § 103(a).

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed February 15, 2011. The foregoing amendments along with arguments and remarks are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (404) 881-7640 or e-mail at chris.haggerty@alston.com to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

The patentability of the independent claim has been argued as set forth above and thus Applicants will not take this opportunity to argue the merits of the rejection with regard to each dependent claim. However, Applicants do not concede that the dependent claims are not independently patentable and reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims at a later date if necessary.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper.

Appl. No.: 10/696,180
Amdt. dated May 16, 2011
Reply to Office Action of February 15, 2011

However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher S. Haggerty/

Christopher S. Haggerty
Registration No. 58,100

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON May 16, 2011.